

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-2, 8-11, 15-19 and 21-22 are amended and claim 23 is added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments or the following remarks is respectfully requested.

A. The Office Action rejects claims 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,969,696 to Stoye and rejects claims 1-2, 8-9, 13-14, 16 and 18-20 under §103(a) over Stoye. The Office Action further rejects claims 3-4, 7, 10, 15 and 17 under §103(a) over Stoye and U.S. Patent No. 5,854,617 to Lee et al. (hereafter "Lee"). Finally, the Office Action rejects claims 5-6 and 11-12 under §103(a) over Stoye, Lee and U.S. Patent No. 5,844,540 to Terasaki. Since the applied references, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest recited features in the pending claims, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye discloses a portable computer system 20 can be connected to several different types of display systems 21, 22 and 23 that each has an interface board 51 and hinge connector 60 that allows the viewing angle of the display screen 70 to be adjusted relative to the portable computer system 20. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that each display system 21, 22 and 23 includes a corresponding power supply, which are different, to provide power for its display screen (e.g., display screen

70). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye does not teach or suggest a computer system that includes at least features of an equipped inverter and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1.

Further, Stoye discloses monitor interface 50 includes a set of sense signals 53 that identify a display system, a set of programmable signals 52, miscellaneous signals 56, and power signals 54 and ground signals 55 that supply the display systems 21, 22 and 23 with power (e.g., 5V, 12V and GND) to drive the display and the backlighting. See Figures 2-3a of Stoye. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye does not teach or suggest at least features of a computer system including an equipped inverter configured to provide driving currents for each installed vendor display type of a plurality of display types and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1. See Figures 1-3b and column 2, lines 6-67 of Stoye. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye does not teach or suggest at least a problem whereby a single driving current can provide a different brightness level for each of a plurality of displays or display types (e.g., vendor display types) that can be installed in a computer system for use with the equipped inverter. See column 2, lines 51-55 of Stoye. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye does not teach or suggest any modification to its disclosure that would result in at least features of an equipped inverter and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1.

With respect to claim 21, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye does not teach or suggest any modification to its disclosure that would result in at least features of wherein the driving device outputs each of the driving currents corresponding to said each of the installable display types such that a brightness level of the installable display types are equally controlled and combinations thereof as recited in claim 21.

Applicants respectfully submit that Lee and Terasaki, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least features of a computer system and combinations thereof as recited in claims 1 and 21, respectively, and lacking from Stoye. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye, Lee and Terasaki, individually or in combination, would not result in at least features of a computer system including an equipped inverter configured to provide driving currents for each installed vendor display type of a plurality of display types and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1 or at least features of wherein the driving device outputs each of the driving currents corresponding to said each of the installable display types such that a brightness level of the installable display types are equally controlled and combinations thereof as recited in claim 21.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 21 respectively define patentable subject matter. Independent claims 8 and 18 define

patentable subject matter for at least reasons similar to claim 1. Independent claims 2, 15 and 16 define patentable subject matter for at least reasons similar to claim 21. Claims 2-7, 9-14, 17 and 19-20 depend from claims 2, 8, 16, 18 and 21, respectively, and therefore also define patentable subject matter for at least that reason as well as their additionally recited features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21-22 under §102 and claims 1-20 under §103 is respectfully requested.

B. Claim 23 is newly added by this Amendment and believed to be in condition for allowance.

Serial No. 10/629,542
Reply to Office Action of November 15, 2005

Docket No. HI-0160

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Carl R. Wesolowski, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carl R. Wesolowski
Registration No. 40,372

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/CRW:jld
Date: FEBRUARY 10, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610